

**Draft Summary of the Engineering and Operations Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
October 25, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting on October 25, 2002 in Oroville and via videoconference and conference call.

A summary of the discussions, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present an informational summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following attachments are provided with this summary:

Attachment 1 Meeting Agenda

Attachment 2 Meeting Attendees

Attachment 3 Table A: Proposed CALSIM II Baseline Inputs for Common Assumptions

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting. The meeting agenda and desired outcomes were reviewed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

### **September 27, 2002 Meeting Summary and Action Items**

A summary of the September 27, 2002 Engineering and Operations Work Group is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

#### **Carry Over Action Items**

**Action Item #EO57:** Review summaries of Engineering and Operations models to be used during relicensing prepared by Modeling Task Force

**Responsible:** Engineering and Operations Work Group participants

**Status:** Curtis Creel reported that the Plenary Modeling Protocol Task Force was currently reviewing the draft summaries, and he would distribute them to the Engineering and Operations Work Group for their review prior to distribution to the Plenary Group.

**Action Item EO#55** Provide summary of watershed modeling issues for Work Group, with input from Work Group participants

**Responsible:** DWR

**Status:** December 2002

**Action Item EO#49** Discuss Fluvial 12 modeling with appropriate DWR and consulting team members to determine data needs.

**Responsible:** Joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force

**Status:** Curtis reported that a Joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force meeting to review Fluvial 12 was held on October 22, 2002, and the Task Force was comfortable with the planned use of Fluvial 12 for geomorphic studies. Ken Kules with Metropolitan Water District said he felt the meeting was very helpful in forwarding the understanding of Fluvial 12 as a tool for implementing Study Plan G2, and his concerns were addressed. He is comfortable that a 2.5-year return flow input, common in bankfull investigations but not appropriate for the Feather River, will not be used in Fluvial 12.

### **Update on Plenary Activities**

The Facilitator updated the participants on the latest Plenary Group activities that included a presentation and discussion of Project Operations. Curtis described his presentation and explained that four graphics he used would be of interest to the Engineering and Operations Work Group. One graphic illustrated pumpback operations contribute roughly 15 percent of annual generation and occur more frequently in the winter months; other graphics show reasons for Lake Oroville releases by calendar year. He suggested that if time permits, he will review these slides today and if not, we will include it on next month's agenda. The participants agreed that this would be useful.

### **CALSIM II Assumptions**

Art Hinojosa with DWR led a discussion of CALSIM II baseline inputs (see Attachment 3 to this summary). He explained that assumption inputs could be categorized as driven by either physical laws and principles, such as topography or facilities, regulations such as instream flow requirements or Bay-Delta standards, or by policies and procedures that include such things as the Coordinated Operations Agreement (COA), Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) and the CALFED Environmental Water Account (EWA).

Kathy Peterson with Oroville Wyandotte asked where the assumptions regarding inflows are shown. Tariq Kadir with DWR explained the long history of hydrologic input development for the model. He described the approach as a depletion analysis that considers agricultural and urban land-use based demands and uses data from both a depletion model and reported operations. The approach and hydrologic assumptions are included in two DWR documents prepared in July 1994 and September 1995. Curtis Creel agreed to make the documents available electronically to the Engineering and Operations Work Group. Sushil Arora with DWR noted that his staff is working on extending the land use period used in CALSIM II to 1998, extending the model period by four years and that the extended period will be used for Bulletin 160. Curtis pointed out that this relicensing process wants to remain consistent with the Bulletin 160 process so we would like to use the same period of record. Curtis agreed to distribute a summary of the input demands from the Bulletin 160 process.

Participants discussed assumptions related to flood control reservoir releases and regulatory standards. Curtis suggested the Corps of Engineers assumptions from their Comprehensive Study need to be included and pointed out that the Biological Opinion for steelhead in the Feather River assumes some flexibility in release requirements that can be tested using the local operations model. Art Hinojosa added that the CALSIM II model is designed to never fall short of the assumed regulatory standards. Curtis explained that the COA defines how the State and the Federal government share in-state responsibilities for water supply with the Federal Central Valley Project (CVP) providing 75 percent and the State Water Project (SWP) responsible for 25 percent of in-basin uses.

Sushil Arora reminded participants that some assumptions are moving targets as model inputs are further refined, and it is more important that when the Engineering and Operations Work Group is ready to run the model, the assumptions are held constant for all runs so when alternative operations scenarios are run, the comparison is 'apples to apples'. Curtis added that some policy drivers such as CVPIA and EWA are adaptively managed programs so it is hard to develop assumptions. Frank Caunt with the Butte County Water Commission asked how these assumptions relate to the FERC relicensing process. Curtis responded that some of them such as regulations related to in-stream flows pose constraints on the operations of Oroville that need to be considered when developing alternative scenarios. The participants agree they need to focus on those assumptions that are sensitive to FERC relicensing and conditions.

### **Next Steps**

The Facilitator informed the Engineering and Operations Work Group that an attorney representing agricultural interests in Butte County had requested we include as an agenda item for the next work group meeting a presentation by Cass Muters with the Agricultural Extension, University of California, Davis, on the relationship between cold water temperature and decreased rice production in Butte County. Frank Caunt suggested that a rice farmer familiar with the issue also be invited to hear the presentation. Ken Kules requested the presentation include potential solutions to the problem and Stuart Edell with Butte County Public Works suggested the Environmental Work Group should be invited due to the relationship of the issue to environmental resources, particularly fisheries. Curtis suggested the group remember to focus on beneficial uses impacted by the project within the FERC relicensing process.

The participants also agreed to discuss the project operations graphics that Curtis had described earlier at the November Work Group meeting.

### **Next Meeting**

The Engineering and Operations Work Group agreed their next meeting would be:

Date: November 22, 2002

Time: 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Location: Oroville Field Division, with videoconference and a conference call-in number available.

### **Action Items**

The following action items were identified by the Engineering and Operations Work Group and include a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

<b>Action Item EO#60</b>	Provide electronic versions of the two reference documents from 1994 and 1995 that outline hydrologic inputs to CALSIM II.
<b>Responsible:</b>	DWR
<b>Due Date:</b>	November 22, 2002

<b>Action Item EO#61</b>	Distribute summary of input demands from Bulletin 160 process.
<b>Responsible:</b>	DWR
<b>Due Date:</b>	November 22, 2002

### ***Carry Over Action Item***

<b>Action Item EO#55</b>	Provide summary of watershed modeling issues for Work Group, with input from Work Group participants.
<b>Responsible:</b>	DWR
<b>Due Date:</b>	December 2002